

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 18, 31, and 37-39 will have been amended. In addition, claims 10, 15, 17, 25-26, and 40-41 will have been canceled, with claims 4-8, 11-14, 16, 19-20, and 27 having been previously canceled.

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his indication that the drawings filed on July 29, 2003 have been accepted and for attaching the Notice of References Cited.

On page 1 of the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner indicated (by virtue of checking box No. 9) that the specification is objected to by the Examiner. On page 7 of the Official Action (paragraph no. 11), the Examiner indicated that the specification is objected to because the lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors, and that the Applicants' cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification. Applicants submit that they are not aware of any errors in the specification and respectfully request that the Examiner remove the objection to the specification.

On page 2 of the outstanding Official Action (paragraph no. 1), the Examiner indicated that claim 15's status identifier in the Response of August 22, 2006 is incorrect. During a telephone conversation between Applicants' representative John Mazzola and the Examiner on May 4, 2007, the Examiner indicated that a portion of the noted paragraph may have been copied from a prior Official Action in the instant

application and that claim 15's status identifier in the Response of February 7, 2007 is correct. In any event, claim 15 has been canceled by virtue of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner objected to claims 18, 21-24, 31-32, and 37-39 for informalities in claims 18 and 31 (claims 21-24 and 37-39 depending from claim 18 either directly or indirectly and claim 32 depending from claim 31). In the present Response, Applicants have amended the noted claims to correct such informalities.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 9, 28-33, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AKINPELU et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,661,792) in view of BOUGHMAN et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,973). The Examiner also rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AKINPELU et al. in view of BOUGHMAN et al., further in view of COCHRANE et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,828). The Examiner also rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AKINPELU et al. in view of BOUGHMAN et al., further in view of KUNG (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,452). The Examiner also rejected claims 10, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-26, and 37-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of AKINPELU et al. in view of COCHRANE et al., further in view of KUNG. The Examiner also rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AKINPELU et al. in view of COCHRANE et al. in view of KUNG, further in view of ZEBRYK (U.S. Patent No. 4,975,942). The Examiner also rejected

P23661.A07

claims 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AKINPELU et al. in view of BOUGHMAN et al., further in view of RFC 3331.

With regard to the Examiner's rejections of claims 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Applicants have amended the noted claims herein.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner indicated on pages 2-3 (paragraph 3) that the first format and the second format as recited in claim 1 are not limited to being different formats and that the Examiner is interpreting the first and second formats as being of the same format. While Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation in this regard, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the second format is distinct from the first format. AKINPELU et al. fails to disclose receiving a request in a first format from a sender for an identity of the caller's local service provider, the call having been suspended at a switch of an interexchange carrier; [and] sending a request in a second format to an LNP database, based on a telephone number of the caller, to determine which of a plurality of databases to query, the second format being distinct from the first format, as recited in claim 1. Further, BOUGHMAN et al. fails to compensate for the deficiencies of AKINPELU et al.

Similarly, Applicants have amended claim 18 to clarify the gateway receiving a request in a first format requesting an identification of the local service provider of the caller, the gateway configured to determine one of a plurality of message types in which to query an identified database, the identified database being determined as a result of sending a request in a second format distinct from the first format to an LNP database

P23661.A07

and receiving a response from the LNP database. Applicants submit that none of the references relied upon by the Examiner, in any proper combination, disclose the claimed combination of features recited in claim 18.

Applicants have also made a number of minor amendments to claims 18, 31, and 37-39, to address issues raised by the Examiner, as noted above.

Applicants note that they have not acquiesced in the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but have amended the claims solely in order to expedite prosecution and to enhance clarity.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 18 are in condition for allowance. With regard to dependent claims 2, 3, 9, 21-24, and 28-39, Applicants assert that they are allowable on their own merit, in addition to being allowable by depending either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 or 18, which Applicants have shown to be allowable.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims in the present application are clearly patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, and an indication to such effect is respectfully requested, in due course.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of the claims, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the claims in view of the present remarks.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe that he has now done so.

Applicant notes the status of the present application as being after final rejection and with respect to such status believes that there is a clear basis for the entry of the present amendment consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Applicant notes that amendments after final are not entered as a matter of right, however, Applicant submits that the amendments made to the pending claims do not raise any new issues requiring further search or consideration. It is also submitted that the present amendment does not raise the question of new matter. Moreover, the present amendment clearly places the present application in condition for allowance, apparently at least due to the Examiner's remarks concerning the claimed first and second formats as discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the present amendment in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and indication of allowability of claims 1-3, 9, 18, 21-24, and 28-39 pending herein.


Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

P23661.A07

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. BRADY et al.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bruce H. Bernstein', written over a horizontal line.

Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

May 29, 2007  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191

William Pieprz  
Reg. No. 33,630